

# RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

4701 WILLARD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND 20815 (301) 656-4068

---

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM The Rudy Maxa Show STATION WRC Radio  
DATE August 28, 1984 9:05 A.M. CITY Washington, D.C.  
SUBJECT Disinformation

RUDY MAXA: My first guest is Jim Guirard, and he has a -- well, a bee in his bonnet is making too light of it. But it clearly is a particular interest of his. It's the use of words in the arena of foreign policy. He thinks we let a lot of people off too lightly by using polite terms when we should be using a little more harsh and critical terms. We'll talk with him about that, and we'll talk about disinformation and rhetoric and how it impacts on us in our foreign policy.

\* \* \*

MAXA: Jim Guirard is my guest, and we're going to ask you to join us. We're going to have a little fun with words. It's a serious issue to some. In the world of propaganda and disinformation, words are the primary weapons.

You mentioned just this morning on Good Morning America there was a piece on Soviet disinformation, Jim?

GUIRARD: Right. The lead item on Good Morning America today was one on Soviet disinformation; in particular, what they call active measures, their plans and policies and cleverly contrived forgeries and planted stories, and so forth, which comprise a great deal of what people normally talk about as disinformation.

Now, my subject is just a little bit different. It has to do with the particular words and phrases and labels.

MAXA: And your thesis is that those words, labels and phrases are not chosen by accident.

---

OFFICES IN: WASHINGTON D.C. • NEW YORK • LOS ANGELES • CHICAGO • DETROIT • AND OTHER PRINCIPAL CITIES

GUIRARD: Well, some of them are chosen quite by accident. Others are not. And it's a mixture of things it gets very difficult to put your finger on. It's hard to tell, for instance, why it is that in a world which despises colonialism -- I'll give you this example -- which despises colonialism, for good reason, why don't we have the sense to call Soviet and Cuban colonies colonies.

MAXA: What do we call them?

GUIRARD: We call them satellites, primarily. But so is the space shuttle. Right outside this station there are a couple of big dishes sitting out on your front lawn which receive messages via satellite. You talk to your parents on holidays via satellite. So the word satellite is in itself so inadequate to the situation that it is disinformational. It causes people to forget or not to realize that the Soviet Union has 25 or 30 colonies of various description. But we never call them that.

And one of the consequences of this is that it allows things to happen which just wouldn't otherwise. It facilitates things that other people say, leaders say which they could not otherwise.

For instance, about three or four months ago the chief of state of Greece, one of our NATO allies, Mr. Papandreou, made a speech to his political party in Athens in which he said that the Soviet Union is not an imperialist nation, like the United States is. Now, how could he say such a thing as that? A couple of reasons.

Number one, we don't call their colonies colonies. We don't call their imperialism imperialism. We call it adventure or adventurism. And we'll get into that in a little while. And since they have no colonies, because we don't call them that, they have no empire. And so the man is at liberty, he's facilitated by our choice of words, or our failure to apply the correct label, to say what he did. And that that an impact all across his nation. It has an impact all across the world among people who are listening to this leader, a responsible man, saying such a thing, which is in itself disinformational, and which is facilitated by the habit of language that we exercise in not applying the correct labels to that system.

MAXA: Why do we use softer terms, satellites instead of colonies, adventurism instead of imperialism, or incursion? Why do we use those words? Because the people who are doing the speaking were brought up in pinstriped diplomatic circumstances and they just natural gravitate to the more neutral words?

GUIRARD: That's part of it. Some of these words -- and

it's very difficult to know which ones they are, historically, unless you just go back and do a tremendous lot of research. Some of them were planted there by the propagandists for our adversaries, our enemies. Others come about in the manner you suggest.

It happens that we are a good and forgiving and trusting people. And when we see something occur out in the world, a happening, a circumstance, an action, we tend not to want to put the most harsh and biting label on it that there is. We want to look at it and, in our wishful thinking, hope that it's something else. And that's as it ought to be. We don't want to be strident and vicious about everything we see and prejudge it as being the worst of all possible worlds.

The problem arises, however, in the fact that...

[Confusion of voices]

GUIRARD: But in our situation, habit of language then takes hold. And after you say the word two or three or four, five or ten or a hundred times and find out later, a year or two later, that you should have applied the harsh label to it, the softer one is already in your vocabulary and in your mind and among your peers, and so forth, and it's then part of the language and very difficult to root out.

There is an interesting quote that I use sometimes by a man who studied the psychology of language and wrote about it many years ago. His name was Ludwig Wittgenstein. And he wrote a book called The Psychology of Language, in which he -- he was describing a situation among the people with whom he had grown up in which they had a mind-set. The book he wrote was Philosophical Investigations -- I'm sorry -- and it was about the psychology of language.

MAXA: I wasn't about to quarrel with you. I haven't heard of Ludwig, myself.

GUIRARD: And he was describing a situation among the people with whom he had grown up in which they had a misimpression, a mind-set about something that they could not shake. And the quote he uses -- he described it as follows: "A picture held us captive, and we could not get outside of it, for it lay in our language, and language seemed to repeat it to us inexorably." It was like a physical boxing, that the language held them into a perception that they knew was wrong, but they couldn't shake because it kept repeating itself in the automatic way in which we talk and think.

MAXA: In the piece you wrote here you've got a great

quote from Senator Daniel Moynihan of New York. He said, "The most brutal totalitarian regimes in the world call themselves liberation movements."

GUIRARD: That's right.

MAXA: "It's perfectly predictable that they should misuse words to conceal their real nature. But must we aid them in that effort by repeating those words?"

GUIRARD: A lot of that repetition is inadvertent. It's done in good faith and without thinking, in part because people do not realize the importance, and the crucial importance, of semantics.

It just so happens that words are the little buggers by which the mind operates. And if you get these words wrong and have so many of them that are inherently disinformational, then you can't build the concepts and the thoughts that lead you in the direction of truth.

Most of us have read George Orwell's great work 1984. One of the major subplots of that work is what the Big Brother, the totalitarian state, the dictatorship does to control the thinking of its people. Big Brother, not wanting the people to think negative thoughts about the dictatorship, simply changes the language, literally removes from the dictionaries and from the libraries and from the books and from newspapers the words and phrases and labels by which people can construct negative thoughts about the state.

Now, that is a deliberate action on their part which George Orwell observed of Stalin and of such people, and tried to warn us about in that book 1984. But still, people don't tune in on it. They say, "Oh, what difference could one word make?"

MAXA: Give us some examples of words that...

GUIRARD: Well, I gave you one a while ago about colonialism.

Another one, one of my pet peeves, is the fact that we call Soviet imperialism, in a world that despises imperialism, we call it adventure. Even the President of the United States went before the British Parliament a couple of years ago and complained about Soviet adventure, or adventurism, in Afghanistan.

Well, I don't know about you, but most of my heroes are adventurers: Marco Polo, Daniel Boone, Neil Armstrong, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, etcetera.

The U.S. Navy, up until about two years ago, had a billboard sign all over the country saying, "Join the Navy. It's not a job, it's an adventure." It's a word that's so positive that we try to attract our young people into the military service by its use.

And so, as a result, in a world which despises colonialism, they very cleverly and wisely call us imperialists. And in a world that loves adventure, we call them adventurers. Very counterproductive sort of thing.

MAXA: Another example.

GUIRARD: Another example, one that is very current in today's politics -- it remains an element in the presidential election. Almost a year ago, the little island of Grenada was liberated. That's the word I like to use. But here again, even in this Administration, with this President, who is very conscious of rhetoric and semantics, and so forth, more than any other, I guess, since Jack Kennedy, perhaps, he went around in circles, and this Administration and this body politic is still going around in circles in a debate over the word invasion versus the word rescue. The word rescue being more favored, you know, by the Administration.

MAXA: Sure.

GUIRARD: The fact is, both of those words are true. There was an invasion. There was a rescue of the American students there. But the politically significant word, the geopolitically significant word was neither of those. It's the word liberation.

The Grenadians were very immediately saying liberation: "Thank God for the Americans. They liberated us." But we have gotten so...

MAXA: And your point, of course, if the Soviets had done that to Grenada, they would be crowing liberation.

GUIRARD: Well, the thing that happens, Rudy, is at the end of World War II we owned that word, very, very powerful word in the languages of the world. We liberated, we had liberated Europe from Hitler. But in the succeeding 40 years, or thereabouts, the Soviets and the Cubans and the Vietnamese have taken that word and have caused it to mean, for all practical purposes, the imposition of their kind of dictatorship on what was formerly a colony, to the point where the word doesn't even come to mind in this country anymore, even with the President.

And that's kind of the Ludwig Wittgenstein thing. You know, inexorably, some other concept comes to mind, and the

truthful definition does not.

In Central America, where, in my opinion, Castro is the villain, causing the strife and warfare and, in his words, liberation, attempts at liberation -- it's an attempt, I think, of his to colonize Nicaragua and El Salvador, and on down the line. And the thing that facilitates his doing that, and dividing the American body politic, is the fact that in our universities, in our churches, in the press, in the State Department, and across the board, we've got into the habit, too many people have, of thinking and writing and speaking about Fidel Castro in such terms as liberation movement, progressive front -- he's supposed to be the leader of the, quote, progressive forces in Central America -- people's democracy, social justice, etcetera.

The problem is, that's not what he's all about. There's nothing progressive about the man. No freedom of the press, no freedom of religion, no freedom of emigration. You can't even get off the island if you want to. It's a prison in itself. No freedom of property or privacy or information or judicial due process, artistic expression. Nothing that a liberal or a progressive would say is important to him.

MAXA: So you prefer to see Cuba referred to as the totalitarian regime of the dictator Fidel Castro.

GUIRARD: Sure. And the word totalitarian is a little bit too long. It's an interesting thing about particular words. You get one that's too long and too hard to remember and say, and people don't use it.

MAXA: Uh-huh.

GUIRARD: And I like to think of Castro as a leader of the Gestapo left. There's nothing progressive about him.

MAXA: Strongman Fidel Castro.

GUIRARD: Well, strongman is not really a correct word either, because Lincoln was a strongman. George Washington was a strongman. Ronald Reagan is a strongman.

MAXA: That's not our idea of...

GUIRARD: He's a dictator. Why not use the proper word?

Poland is an interesting example having to do with the word dictator. And I'll contrast Poland to Chile, for instance, as a double standard. This is one other problem.

In Chile there is a military dictator. His name is General Pinochet. And he's called a military dictator. Read the papers. That's what he's called. Fine. That's great.

In Poland there's another military dictator, General Jaruzelski. But very seldom is he called a military dictator. Typically, he is referred to as a martial-law leader.

MAXA: Hmm.

GUIRARD: Think about that word, martial. Most people don't know what the word martial means. They don't stop to think. Is it martial music, a la John Philip Sousa? Or are you talking about Marshal Dillon on the Wild West show, or what?

MAXA: Martial arts.

GUIRARD: Martial arts.

Followed by two very positive laws: law -- we're a nation of laws -- leader. That's a very positive word. Reagan claims to be a leader, in contrast to his opposition. Both of these are very significant words.

MAXA: We'll be right back. We're talking about words and their power.

\*

\*

\*

MAXA: We're talking with Jim Guirard and we're talking about labels and words and loaded words and not so loaded words and how we refer to American foreign policy moves and foreign foreign policy moves. It's Mr. Guirard's contention that we are letting a lot of people off the hook by using too-nice words.

He has a list he handed me during the break of white-hat labels and black-hat labels. White-hat labels like liberation movements, progressive fronts, people's democracies, forces of socialism. Black-hat labels like imperialist, colonialist, fascist, racist, forces of reaction.

We invite you to join us in this conversation....

You were saying also during the break that it's not so much the individual use of one word now and then, but the cumulative effect that paints a picture that is not an accurate photograph.

GUIRARD: Exactly. And in my conversations with people about this, in trying to heighten their awareness of the problem, oftentimes I get a response, "What difference does one word

make? Whether we call it liberation or invasion, you know, big deal."

And the thing -- my response is that it is not in any one of these particular words, or any two or three of them. It is in the cumulative effect of 20 or 30 or 50 or 100, and it sets up a pattern of thinking.

And this is the thing that Senator Moynihan, four or five years ago -- you read his quote a while ago -- was complaining about. He says, you know, "But must we aid them in calling themselves liberation movements and progressive fronts?" And he says, "Worse" -- his final statement in that paragraph was, "Worse, do we begin to influence our own perceptions by using them?" by using those words.

And I like to describe the total impact, to describe it as a kind of erosion. It's kind of like soil erosion. If you lose a quarter of an inch or a tenth of an inch off your topsoil this year, your crop still comes up next year. But in the cumulative effect, if you lose that same tenth of an inch over 40 years in a row, pretty soon your crop will not grow. And in this situation, the public mind is warped out into shape into believing, by these labels, facilitated by these labels, that we're the bad guys in the world; and somehow, the forces of socialism are the good guys in the world.

And one of the things that permits this to happen is the tendency on our part to think of the left, the ultra-left (communism) and the ultra-right (fascism), as being different, essentially inherently different from each other, when in fact they are just, for all practical purposes, clones, one of the other. They're not extremes on a spectrum. They are -- they stomp on human beings the same way. But the notion that Hitler and Stalin were different creatures is entirely an erroneous one. Just because one is left and one is right in our language doesn't mean that that's a matter of fact.

Both of them were socialists. You can't be a totalitarian without being a socialist. This is something that people don't really realize. If the word total within totalitarian means anything, then the dictator must own the economy, or he must control it to a degree that is tantamount to ownership.

So, Hitler was a socialist. He called his National Socialism. Mussolini was a socialist. Before he created the label fascism, which is one of the ultimate black-hat labels in the world today -- if you're a fascist you're without redeeming qualities and can never be redeemed. Now, before he created that ism called fascism to suit his own purposes, he was Italy's leading socialist. And in his own writings for ten years before

that, he was a self-pronounced, self-declared Marxist.

But the words left and right give us the impression that these so-called extremes on the political spectrum are different. They're not.

MAXA: You're on WRC.

WOMAN: ...There are a few words I'd like to ask this gentleman about....

Mr. Guirard, how about incursion and invasion, the way those two are sort of interposed?

GUIRARD: Both of those are, you know, on the negative side of the listing. Incursion or invasion or intrusion are all synonyms for things we should not do. And the example I gave a while ago about Grenada. The word invasion was seen as a very negative interpretation of what happened there; whereas the word liberation was the proper one.

WOMAN: Incursion sounds to me like a less lethal word. So it seems to be used by people who are talking about the left, like in Russia, when there is an incursion. But I would call it an invasion.

GUIRARD: Well, they would always tend to apply it to their activities, the less sharp-edged, the less critical word. And often we tend to do the same thing. In the fashion I described a while ago to Rudy, we tend to put a softer label on things because we don't want to be bellicose and stridently rhetorical, and so forth. And when it turns out to be an invasion rather than a soft-hearted incursion of some kind, then it's too late. We've adopted the word and we're stuck with it then.

WOMAN: Unfortunately, that happens.

And you know another word -- it's not a word, actually. It's used now in schools a great deal, LRC. It's become abbreviated. It's a learning resource center. And that's a euphemism for a library, isn't it?

GUIRARD: Yes, that's correct. The word game goes on, you know, in many, many different ways.

MAXA: That's word inflation.

GUIRARD: That's right.

And, of course, in our commercial world, we're very

conscious of the uses and misuses of words, to the point where the Congress has had to pass truth-in-labeling and truth-in-advertising laws to keep people within bounds, so they do not misrepresent and give the public disinformational words about the products and services they're trying to sell.

But in the foreign affairs area, we forget that it is such a powerful thing, and the field is left almost wide open to our enemies, our adversaries, which -- there again, choose which word you like. I tend to like the word enemies, because they certainly consider us their enemy. No question about it.

WOMAN: And I also a lot of meaning is lost in translation, too. Because sometimes the English language is so broad, there are so many words that can be used the same thing, that when you try to translate things, it's rather difficult. And sometimes it comes a narrow meeting rather...

GUIRARD: I'll give you an example about the translatability of words from one to the other. In Nicaragua right now we have the group that the United States has been supporting called the Contras, the counterrevolution, which means counter-revolution in the normal sense. And they, themselves, and we, those of us supporting them in this country, have been trying to call them freedom fighters, rather than Contras, which in the English language works out very well. You have a double f, an alliteration there, freedom fighters. It works out very well.

But in the Spanish language, where it's most relevant, you try to say freedom fighters, translate that directly, and you have a very difficult time. People disagree on how to say it and it's a long phrase [Spanish expression], and it just doesn't come out. It's kind of like totalitarianism, about twice as long as the word totalitarian, and the word just doesn't work too well.

My suggestion, in terms of the Contras, where that word means, is almost like the first half of the word counterrevolution, is to reverse the psychology of that label by speaking instead of the revolutionary Contras. Just put the word in front of the one, and it becomes then -- they become the revolutionary counter -- what? -- counter-Communists. And you change the whole psychology of the world Contras by putting the modifier in front of it.

They are conducting a revolution. It's the new revolution in Nicaragua. But nobody calls the word revolution.

MAXA: We'll be back with Jim Guirard.

\*

\*

\*

MAXA: My guest this hour is Jim Guirard. He's a local,

Washington-based attorney and a government affairs consultant, and he has -- shall we call this a hobby, a passion? -- an interest in watching semantics and the use of words, particularly in the foreign affairs arena. And he says we are too polite in the words that we use of our enemies. And he doesn't mind using the word enemies, as opposed to adversaries.

You're on WRC.

WOMAN: I have a word particularly, Mr. Guirard, that you use that irritates me every time I heard it because it seems clumsy and cumbesome and unnecessary, and that's disinformation. I don't understand the use of that at all. There are so many good words in the English language that can be used in its place and say precisely the same thing that are shorter. And dis-information says nothing to me. If I heard someone use it, I stop listening.

MAXA: What would you prefer, like propaganda?

WOMAN: I like propaganda, or just plain lying. There are endless words.

And you give me the impression that you think that language is a static thing, and language is not a static thing. It develops and continues to increase its size all the time, and it should. It can't be dead and we can't just keep saying the same old trite things.

GUIRARD: You're absolutely right. In fact, if you look in the dictionary you will not find the word disinformation. The reason it came into our language was the fact the Soviets created a department, a bureau of disinformation. At least their word, when we translate it into the English, becomes the word dis-information.

And one of the things that I try to get people to think about -- and you're right on the track on this -- that we need to practice some semantic engineering to get away from words that don't suit our purposes, that don't -- they're too long, too cumbersome, or that distract us from the truth.

I like to say that, for instance, we need a new word -- we need one, at your suggestion, for disinformation, and we ought to try to come up with one. We need a new word, too, for the concept of a defunct, corrupted revolution. There's only one word for revolution we have, which covers everything from our kind of revolution, which was pointed at individual civil liberties and human dignity, to Castro's kind of revolution, which is pointed specifically at the imposition of a dictatorship. Now we need, in my impression, a new word, a different

word to cover the ground of a corrupt, defunct revolution which no longer deserves to be called by that honorable name. And that requires semantic engineering.

WOMAN: There's one other word that I hesitate and I'm reluctant to see used overly in diplomacy, and that is enemies. Because in my lifetime, I have seen three of our major enemies become our closest working partners. And it seems to always go in that pattern, cyclically.

GUIRARD: Well, I don't think that you could say, really -- I hear what you're saying. I don't think that you could say Nazi Germany has become our friend. The thing of it is, that wasa repressive dictatorship where a certain nation, which is different from what it was under Hitler, is now our friend, or a certain nation, Japan, is now a friend, when they were previously our enemies. But the entire character of that nation and the government which controls it are like night and day. It's 180 degrees off from what it was.

WOMAN: They are no longer our enemies.

GUIRARD: No, the current government is not. But that doesn't make it any less true that Naziism and Hitler were indeed our enemies, just as Communism is today. And one of the things that helps define that word, whether you're talking about enemies or adversaries, how does that government consider us? Do they consider us their deadly enemy? And in fact, they do today.

WOMAN: That may be.

GUIRARD: One of the things I might mention here in terms of words and the psychology of them and how to change them and how to do a better job of it: Earlier this year, a presidential commission, in part in response to representations and work I did before that commission, has recommended the creation of a National Security Council task force, a White House task force on disinformational semantics -- here I go using the word again -- in foreign policy affairs to try to define the problem, come up with potential solutions to it, both in the public and the private sectors, and to make the people aware of what is going on -- people particularly in the universities, in the churches, in the press, in the State Department -- so that they, in their workaday routines, knowing that it is a problem, will tend to come up with solutions of their own.

MAXA: You're on WRC.

MAN: Mr. Guirard, it's just such a pleasure to discover you. And I constantly wonder why there aren't more people like you being more vocal than they are.

I'm in the process of having a manuscript finally edited which deals with exactly the same problem you're talking about, only I deal with it in terms of this misuse of words causing miseducation among the population. So that topics that are really important are handled so clumsily that nobody every focuses on what the real problem is.

And my particular thing this morning -- it's almost as if there was a little ESP going here, because I was constructing a monologue dealing with abortion this morning when you came along with his program. And I was thinking, to use abortion as an example, what they're talking about -- pro-abortionists and pro-lifers are both wrong. Because of the semantic situation, we don't focus on the real issue, is whether a law dealing with abortion is worthwhile or not. In my opinion, I don't think that the government has any right to be in this business at all. This is entirely a personal problem. But everybody agrees that abortion is wrong. I mean that's a foregone conclusion.

GUIRARD: I'd be delighted for you to get in touch with me. One of the things I try to do is to search out people who have been thinking about this general subject. You find many individuals who are concerned about it, as you obviously are, and are writing about it.

MAN: I've spent a whole life on this. My thesis and my work is that we don't recognize violence, that we take what we construe to be non-violence to be not a threatening thing, when in fact we are reactive people and we react to force and control. And until we identify that as the cause of the way that we act or react, that we're not going to be able to solve the problem.

Having heard you speak, I want very, very much to get in touch with you. I'm without an automobile today, but Rudy has my address. And if he'd give it to you, I'd appreciate your getting in touch with me.

MAXA: How do you feel about giving your phone number out?

GUIRARD: Oh, that's fine. No problem at all.

MAXA: Why don't we give you Jim's number and cut out the middleman?

GUIRARD: The number is 293-3411.

\*

\*

\*

GUIRARD: I'd like to give a very simple quote from a great parliamentarian and legislator of the last century,

Benjamin Disraeli, a British Prime Minister, who was very much conscious of this problem and the opportunities it presented and the dangers it presented. His little quote is as follows: He says, "Few ideas are correct ones. And none can ascertain which they are. It is with words we govern men."

And Stalin knew this very well. One of his biographers, Professor Robert Tucker, quotes Stalin as having believed -- and I'll give you this little quote, and then we'll get on to our next caller. He said about Stalin, "Of all monopolies enjoyed by the state, none would be so crucial as its monopoly on the definition of words. The ultimate weapon of political control would be the dictionary."

MAXA: Stalin would have loved all-talk radio.

You're on WRC.

MAN: I have two questions for Mr. Guirard. First, I want to know if he can tell me why the news media refers to the PLO as guerrillas instead of terrorists. And next, if he thinks that instead of calling the Palestine Liberation Organization, if we started to call them the Palestinian Terrorist Organization, the PTO, that it would have any significant impact on the Middle East war.

GUIRARD: Sure, it could in the long run have an impact. Of course, one of the things you have is that the PLO, the Palestinian Liberation Organization, you know, christened itself. They put a euphemism on their organization which is repeated by everyone and which gets into language. It's just like the Soviet Union and its colonies call themselves people's democracies, the same psychology.

And how you get out of this thing is a complicated matter. The problem that I see is that nobody is really putting much intellectual brain power into figuring out ways of how to do it, how to disconnect the PLO from the label liberation, and even from the word guerrillas. They are a terrorist organization. And the thing that I'm trying to do is to raise the consciousness of people about this problem and get a lot of bright people in the universities, in the churches, in the press, in the State Department and the body politic to thinking about these things and coming up with strategies to solve the problem that you so correctly identify.

MAXA: We'll be back in a moment.

\*

\*

\*

MAXA: You're on WRC.

MAN: My comment is this. I also happen to be writing a manuscript on this general subject, and I think this whole business of semantic infiltration relates to a larger process, which I call threat deception. And I think the media has played a major role in this, whereby the process whereby the major threat to the United States is portrayed as coming from the right side of the political spectrum rather than the left side, whereby the Republic of South Africa, Argentina, Chile become the major threats that the United States are made aware of through their media, whereas the Soviet Union and Cuba and the proxy states are portrayed in a much more euphemistic light.

MAXA: Are you asking for a reaction?

MAN: Yeah.

GUIRARD: Well, that's exactly like. Over the last --well, since World War II, the psychology of language has pointed us into the direction that it's a conflict between the forces of socialism -- ipso facto white hat -- versus the forces of fascism, repression, etcetera.

The Communists try to persuade mankind that it's a two-dimensional choice: either those bad guys or us good guys. And the language of left and right in this spectrum, this so-called political spectrum leads us in that direction, when actually it's a multi-dimensional choice. The thing that we ought to get people to realize, that it's either one of those bad guys, either the Nazis or the Communists, both of whom are basically mirrors, reflections of each other, or the civil libertarian options, with freedom of the press and religion and emigration and judicial due process, and all the things that any good conservative or any good liberal would tend to accept and agree with.

MAN: I think one of the points that's very often missed is the role that this process of threat deception plays in the Soviet strategic thinking. I don't think we've ever confronted an adversary in our history, and certainly not in our lifetimes, where state policy is such that it actually calculates an attempt to portray, to force on a target population the notion that there is no threat from the source of the threat.

Would you comment on that?

GUIRARD: Well, you're right. It's an attempt to put, as I said a while ago, the white had on themselves, to the point that they are perceived as just the opposite of what they are.

Senator Moynihan, again, has talked about that. The U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, in its recommendation for the White House task force I mentioned a while ago,

calls it an attempt to portray themselves as the antithesis of what they really are.

MAN: That's absolutely right.

GUIRARD: And their propagandists and their whole system takes a position that they should not have an armed military conflict where there would be at least a 50-50 chance of their being defeated, maybe greater. And so, therefore, their intention is in the long run -- they have a different view of time and of history than we do -- is to just pick ups apart piece-by-piece and to do primarily, in great part, by removing from our body politic our own attitudes of self-esteem and attitudes of propriety and justice in the world and what we stand for. And if they cause such disunity among our people, in terms of perceptions, then they'll have us.

Three of four months ago Jim Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense and head of CIA and three or other agencies, was complaining about the lack of bipartisanship in our politics today. And one of the things he says goes, I think, to language and the thing we're talking about. He said bipartisanship cannot be restored unless there is an agreed perception of a common enemy or threat.

MAN: Absolutely.

GUIRARD: And absent that agreed perception, there can be no consensus.

And so if they can -- if the Soviets and their propaganda and their disinformation can keep us from ever arriving at a consensus in this country, or in a consensus with our NATO allies, then divided we fall.

MAN: Just let me cite one personal vignette on how far this thing went back in the '70s. The military's concession to the contract then was eliminating from all -- I was an intelligence officer back then. We were forbidden in any training exercise to make any reference to the North Vietnamese, the Soviet Union, the Cubans. Instead we had to substitute euphemisms. We could not cite actual existing Soviet military equipment, such as the JS -- the Stalin 3 battle tank. We had to substitute a word called the taboo for that.

GUIRARD: Yeah. It's an effort on our part to soften the words and believe -- it's just wishful thinking -- that they will respond by suddenly becoming nice guys.

MAXA: You're on WRC.

MAN: Mr. Guirard, I wanted to make a comment. An

example, I think, is really important. You've got Ferdinand Marcos out in the Philippines, who says he's pro-American. But essentially, what he has is a dictatorship. But for as long as he continues to say that he is a pro-American, and we can maintain military bases in that area, it doesn't make any difference what he does, because the language will be rephrased so that it looks as though he's doing a good thing. And I think it's really...

MAXA: In all honesty, Jim, you've got to say this cuts both ways. I mean there is some -- there are some padded words, if you would, certainly applied to rightist regimes also.

GUIRARD: That's right. No, this is part of the whole mix of problem.

Now, whether you would call Marcos, to the same degree, a military dictator as Pinochet in Chile or Jaruzelski in Poland remains open to debate. He's an authoritarian head of state who will not give up power and who does not have free, open multiparty elections.

MAN: That's true. But if you were a Qaddafi or Idi Amin, then there would be no question as to his good or evil or traits. It would be clear-cut and defined as the media or State Department or whoever is in charge of deciding what the policy is going to be toward his organization, toward his government, they would just lambaste him.

GUIRARD: I might mention, since we're talking about Marcos and authoritarian heads of state like that, in the long historical trend, we find a number of examples where countries headed by such people are now multiparty, civil libertarian, pluralist democracies.

MAN: What does that mean?

GUIRARD: Well, that they have the capacity to grow and to change into the kinds of systems that we like to call ourselves. Where the Communist system is such a bureaucracy and is so firmly entrenched, that that never happens.

I'll give you some examples. In Greece today, for instance. The colonels were in control for a number of years. It's now a multiparty, civil libertarian democracy headed by a man who I don't particularly approve of, but the people chose him. And they may kick him out two or three years from now when their elections come up.

Spain, which was headed by Franco, is now a pluralist democracy. Portugal, same thing. Venezuela, same thing.

MAN: I'm wondering, though, is there ever any time when, after observing the doings of such people as a Marcos or Idi Amin or someone like that, that the government will change its attitude? An example, the Shah. We were great supporters of the Shah, and then there was a great falling away, simply because it seemed to be no longer a supportable position.

GUIRARD: That's a very difficult position that we find ourselves in. We face these situations, like in the case of the Shah, for instance. The time at which he fell from power was at the very time that he was trying to liberalize and to correct some of his faults. And he was still a very faulty person. But in the end, he gets replaced by an even more repressive regime.

MAN: But is it possible for us to pass judgment on their social structure?

GUIRARD: Well, the thing we like to try to do is to encourage pluralism and the true choice of the people. All these dictatorships, ultra-right and ultra-left, usually talk in such terms as people, you know, the people's will, and so forth. And we ought to try and take them at their word. And among those that are trying to be cooperative with us, try to influence them in a positive sense. And those that declare themselves to be our enemies, we have to take a different attitude toward them, by their own definitions.

MAXA: We're talking with Jim Guirard. He's a Washington attorney and a government affairs consultant, and he has a particular interest in the use of words and semantics as applies to foreign affairs.

\*

\*

\*